



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,670	06/24/2005	Chin Chang	US020636	2905

24737 7590 12/28/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

RAINEY, ROBERT R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/28/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/540,670

Applicant(s)

CHANG, CHIN

Examiner

Robert R. Rainey

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 17 and 19** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,717,355 to *Takahashi et al.* ("*Takahashi*").

As to claim 1, *Takahashi* discloses a method to provide color temperature correction in emission spectra of a phosphor converted LED (see for example column 3 line 56 to column 4 line 20 or Fig. 1 and column 8 line 66 to column 9 line 1 noting that "fluorescent material", i.e. item number 36, is an alternate expression for "phosphor") under PWM current drive comprising (see for example column 6 lines 31-32 "driven by a pulse current"); determining a modulation for a driving current signal (see for example column 6 lines 20-32 noting that in order for the color tone to be "adjusted delicately" by the "time sharing" the time sharing modulation must first be determined); modulating a constant magnitude current signal based on the determined modulation (see for example column 6 lines 20-32 noting that the modulation is based on time that "a

pulse current" is applied); and applying the modulated current signal to cause a color temperature correction in the emission spectra of the LED (see for example column 6 lines 20-32 noting that adjusting the "color tone" is equivalent to "color temperature correction").

As to **claim 8**, in addition to the rejection of claim 1 *Takahashi* further discloses that applying the modulated current signal includes selectively coupling a power supply to a phosphor converted LED based on the determined modulation (see for example column 6 lines 31-32 "driven by a pulse current", which would not occur unless the power supply were selectively coupled to the LED).

As to **claim 9**, in addition to the rejection of claim 8 *Takahashi* further discloses that the LED is a phosphor converted white light LED (see for example column 6 line 29 "white light").

Claims 11 and 19 claim the structure implicit in the method claimed in claim 1 and are rejected on the same grounds and arguments as claim 1.

As to **claim 17**, in addition to the rejection of claim 11 *Takahashi* further discloses that the LED is a white light phosphor converted LED (see for example column 6 line 29 "white light").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 10, 12-16, and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,717,355 to *Takahashi et al.* ("*Takahashi*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,249 to *Kamikawa et al.* ("*Kamikawa*").

As to **claim 2**, in addition to the rejection of claim 1 over *Takahashi*:

Takahashi does not expressly disclose that determining a modulation includes determining a first LED emission spectra color coordinate set and a second LED emission spectra color coordinate set wherein the first color coordinate set represents LED emission spectra at a first LED operational temperature and the second color coordinate set represents a CCT shift in the LED emission spectra due to operation of the LED at a second operational temperature.

Kamikawa discloses a method for driving a light emitting apparatus and in particular: that determining a modulation includes determining a first LED emission spectra color coordinate set and a second LED emission spectra color

Art Unit: 2629

coordinate set wherein the first color coordinate set represents LED emission spectra at a first LED operational temperature (see for example column 1 lines 42-48, with the un-increased temperature being the first temperature and the un-red-shifted spectrum being the first coordinate set) and the second color coordinate set represents a CCT shift in the LED emission spectra due to operation of the LED at a second operational temperature (see for example column 1 lines 42-48, with the increased temperature being the second temperature and the red-shifted spectrum being the second coordinate set) (further see column 5 lines 1-3, which teach suppression of variation in light color).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of *Takahashi* to control the effects of color change with temperature as taught by *Kamikawa*. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to suppress variation of the light color (see for example *Kamikawa* column 4 line 62 to column 5 line 3).

As to **claim 3**, in addition to the rejection of claim 2 over *Takahashi* and *Kamikawa*, *Kamikawa* further discloses the current signal modulation is

Art Unit: 2629

determined such that applying the determined current signal modulation to the LED causes the LED emission spectra at the first color coordinate set (see for example column 1 lines 42-48, with the un-increased temperature being the first temperature and the un-red-shifted spectrum being the first coordinate set) to be substantially constant as the LED operational temperature changes from the first LED operational temperature to the second LED operational temperature (see for example column 1 lines 42-48, with the increased temperature being the second temperature, and further see column 5 lines 1-3, which teach suppression of variation in light color).

Arguments for analogous art, obviousness and suggestion/motivation are the same as for the parent claim.

As to **claim 4**, in addition to the rejection of claim 1 over *Takahashi*:

Takahashi does not expressly disclose that the modulation includes changing the current signal frequency.

Kamikawa discloses that the modulation includes changing the current signal frequency (see for example column 11 lines 1-2, especially “changing the number of pulses in a predetermined time”).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use variable frequency PWM as taught by *Kamikawa* with the method of *Takahashi*. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to separately control the emission wavelength and emission power (see for example *Kamikawa* column 1 lines 51-52).

As to **claim 5**, in addition to the rejection of claim 1 over *Takahashi*, *Takahashi* further discloses that the modulation includes changing the current signal pulse width (see for example column 6 lines 18-32 noting that for a given persistence of the fluorescence, adjusting the “time sharing” of the direct and fluorescent emissions involves a change in the on time of the LED, i.e. a change in the pulse width).

Takahashi does not expressly disclose that the modulation includes changing the current signal duty-cycle.

Kamikawa discloses that the duty (i.e. duty-cycle) is set to a value corresponding to an emission intensity of the LED (see for example column 4 lines 9-10) and that duty-cycle may be changed either by changing the pulse-width and holding the frequency constant or changing the frequency and holding the pulse-width constant (see for example column 10 lines 64-67).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

Art Unit: 2629

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use variable duty cycle PWM as taught by *Kamikawa* with the method of *Takahashi*. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to separately control the emission wavelength and emission power (see for example *Kamikawa* column 1 lines 51-52).

As to **claim 6**, in addition to the rejection of claim 5 over *Takahashi* and *Kamikawa*:

Kamikawa further discloses that the total light output of the LED is changed responsive to the changing of the current signal duty cycle (see for example column 4 lines 9-10).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use variable duty cycle PWM as taught by *Kamikawa* with the method of *Takahashi*. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to separately control the emission wavelength and emission power (see for example *Kamikawa* column 1 lines 51-52).

As to **claim 7**, in addition to the rejection of claim 5 over *Takahashi* and *Kamikawa*:

Takahashi further discloses (to restate the conclusion of the arguments of the rejection of claim 1) changing the color of the LED by changing the pulse-width of the current pulse with respect to the persistence of the fluorescence or alternately stated *Takahashi* discloses keeping the pulse-width constant in order to maintain a desired color (see for example *Takahashi* column 6 lines 18-32 and the rejection of claim 1 for further details)

Kamikawa further discloses that the duty (i.e. duty-cycle) is set to a value corresponding to an emission intensity of the LED (see for example column 4 lines 9-10) and that duty-cycle may be changed either by changing the pulse-width and holding the frequency constant or changing the frequency and holding the pulse-width constant (see for example column 10 lines 64-67).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to set the pulse width for a given desired color according to the method of *Takahashi*, while achieving a desired total light output of the LED, i.e. constant, by setting the duty-cycle as taught by *Kamikawa* and to achieve the desired duty-cycle for a given pulse-width by varying the current signal frequency as further taught by *Kamikawa*. The suggestion/motivation

Art Unit: 2629

would have been to provide advantages such as to separately control the emission wavelength and emission power (see for example *Kamikawa* column 1 lines 51-52).

As to **claim 10**, in addition to the rejection of claim 9 over *Takahashi*, *Takahashi* discloses (to restate the conclusion of the arguments of the rejection of claim 1) changing the color of the LED by changing the pulse-width of the current pulse with respect to the persistence of the fluorescence (see for example *Takahashi* column 6 lines 18-32 and the rejection of claim 1 for further details)

Takahashi does not expressly disclose that the LED junction emission intensity is substantially constant while the phosphor emission intensity is increased responsive to the current signal modulation.

Kamikawa discloses that the duty (i.e. duty-cycle) is set to a value corresponding to an emission intensity of the LED (see for example column 4 lines 9-10) and that duty-cycle may be changed either by changing the pulse-width and holding the frequency constant or changing the frequency and holding the pulse-width constant (see for example column 10 lines 64-67).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine the pulse width required for a desired color, i.e. one with relatively more fluorescent emission versus junction emission than a given color, according to the method of *Takahashi* and to achieve a desired brightness, i.e. one corresponding to constant total junction emission, by adjusting the frequency such that the duty-cycle of the current pulse and junction emission remain constant, i.e. by increasing the frequency as taught by *Kamikawa* since the color change required a decrease in the pulse width. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to separately control the emission wavelength and emission power (see for example *Kamikawa* column 1 lines 51-52).

As to **claim 12**, in addition to the rejection of claim 11 over *Takahashi*, *Takahashi* further discloses that the modulation includes changing the constant-current magnitude signal pulse width (see for example column 6 lines 18-32 noting that for a given persistence of the fluorescence, adjusting the “time sharing” of the direct and fluorescent emissions involves a change in the on time of the LED, i.e. a change in the pulse width).

Takahashi does not expressly disclose that the control circuit includes pulse width modulator circuit having configurable frequency and duty cycle.

Kamikawa discloses that disclose that the control circuit includes a constant-current magnitude pulse width modulator circuit having configurable

Art Unit: 2629

frequency (see for example column 11 lines 1-2, especially “changing the number of pulses in a predetermined time”) and duty cycle (see for example column 4 lines 9-10).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a pulse width modulator circuit having configurable frequency and duty cycle as taught by *Kamikawa* with the apparatus after *Takahashi*. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to separately control the emission wavelength and emission power (see for example *Kamikawa* column 1 lines 51-52).

As to **claim 13**, in addition to the rejection of claim 12 over *Takahashi* and *Kamikawa*, *Takahashi* further discloses that the control circuit includes a power supply selectively arranged to deliver power to the pulse width modulator circuit. (see for example column 6 lines 31-32 “driven by a pulse current”, which would not occur unless the power supply were coupled to the pulse width modulator circuit).

Arguments for analogous art, obviousness and suggestion/motivation are the same as for the parent claim.

Art Unit: 2629

As to **claim 14**, in addition to the rejection of claim 11 over *Takahashi*:

Takahashi does not expressly disclose that the control circuit includes a processor control system.

Kamikawa discloses that the control circuit includes a processor control system (see for example Fig. 1 item 101 "CALCULATION PROCESSOR").

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a processor control system in the control circuit as taught by *Kamikawa* with the apparatus after *Takahashi*. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to calculate and output a duty signal (see for example *Kamikawa* column 7 lines 14-15).

As to **claim 15**, in addition to the rejection of claim 14 over *Takahashi* and *Kamikawa*:

Takahashi as represented in the rejection of claim 11, which is the apparatus implied by the method of claim 1, describes the steps claimed in claim 15, i.e. determining a modulation for an LED driving current signal; modulating a constant magnitude current signal based on the determined modulation; and

Art Unit: 2629

applying the modulated current signal to the LED to cause a color temperature correction in the emission spectra of the LED.

Kamikawa as covered in the rejection of claim 14 discloses the assignment of various such functions to a processor control system.

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to includes a processor control system in the control circuit as taught by *Kamikawa* with the apparatus after *Takahashi* and further to assign to the processor control system the claimed steps. The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to calculate and output a duty signal (see for example *Kamikawa* column 7 lines 14-15) or to avoid duplicating resources by assigning some functions to one control element and others to another element.

As to **claim 16**, in addition to the rejection of claim 15 over *Takahashi* and *Kamikawa*:

Kamikawa further discloses that determining a modulation includes determining a first LED emission spectra color coordinate set and a second LED emission spectra color coordinate set wherein the first color coordinate set represents LED emission spectra at a first LED operational temperature (see for

example column 1 lines 42-48, with the un-increased temperature being the first temperature and the un-red-shifted spectrum being the first coordinate set) and the second color coordinate set represents a CCT shift in the LED emission spectra due to operation of the LED at a second operational temperature (see for example column 1 lines 42-48, with the increased temperature being the second temperature and the red-shifted spectrum being the second coordinate set) (further see column 5 lines 1-3, which teach suppression of variation in light color) and that the current signal modulation is determined such that applying the determined current signal modulation to the LED causes the LED emission spectra at the first color coordinate set (see for example column 1 lines 42-48, with the un-increased temperature being the first temperature and the un-red-shifted spectrum being the first coordinate set) to be substantially constant as the LED operational temperature changes from the first LED operational temperature to the second LED operational temperature (see for example column 1 lines 42-48, with the increased temperature being the second temperature, and further see column 5 lines 1-3, which teach suppression of variation in light color).

Takahashi and *Kamikawa* are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, which is LED lights, and further because they seek to solve the same problem, which is to provide single color LEDs with color control.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of *Takahashi* to control the effects of color change with temperature as taught by *Kamikawa*. The

Art Unit: 2629

suggestion/motivation would have been to provide advantages such as to suppress variation of the light color (see for example *Kamikawa* column 4 line 62 to column 5 line 3).

As to **claim 18**, in addition to the rejection of claim 15 over *Takahashi* and *Kamikawa*:

Takahashi further discloses that the LED is an InGaN phosphor converted white-light LED (see for example column 6 line 29 "white light" and column 4 line 13 "Ga...In...N").

Kamikawa further discloses that the LED is an InGaN phosphor converted white-light LED (see for example column 15 lines 54-57 "white" and column 6 line 31 "InGaN").

Arguments for analogous art, obviousness and suggestion/motivation are the same as for the parent claim.

Claim Objections

5. The claims are objected to because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses. Claims 1-19 require correction.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so

Art Unit: 2629

as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims.

See MPEP § 608.01(m).

6. Claims 2 and 16 objected to because of the following informalities: These claims use the term "CCT". This term requires definition within the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

7. The drawings are objected to because the unlabeled rectangular boxes and all flow chart boxes shown in the drawings should be provided with descriptive text labels. Figures 5-8 need to be corrected. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are

Art Unit: 2629

not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0001225 to Yoshimura et al. discloses mixing led and phosphor light via time division to control tone.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Rainey whose telephone number is (571) 270-3313. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on (571) 272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RR/


AMARE MENGISTU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER